THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.23150 OF 2005

DATED:27.10.2005

Between:

Mulpur Raju Suresh Kumar

…Petitioner

And

Visakhaptnam Municipal Corporation

Rep. by its Commissioner

Visakhapatnam and another

…Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.23150 OF 2005

ORDER:

The petitioner is owner of houses bearing D.Nos.14-37-41, 14-37-41/1, 14-37-41/1A at Krishna Nagar, Maharanipeta, Visakhapatnam. The respondent sent a communication on 6.7.2005 asking the petitioner to give consent for surrendering an extent of 60.55 Sq.yards as per the plan for widening the road from Collector Office to Z.P.Road. The petitioner states that he is not willing to give his consent and that any action on the part of Visakhaptnam Municipal Corporation (VMC) without due process of law under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 would be illegal.

VMC sought consent of the owner for advance possession in larger public interest. It does not, however, mean that in the event of owner of the property not

willing to give consent, the respondent VMC would resort to high-handed action. In such case, the VMC has to necessarily resort to provisions of Section 147 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 (for short, the Act). In **Srichand Rohra v. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad** while dealing with similar matter, this Court made the following observations.

> A reading of the said letter does not in any way indicate that there is any truth in the submission made by the learned Counsel for the petitioners. What was sought to by issuing such letter is, a request was made to the landlords to give consent to handover advanced possession in the larger public interest. It was clearly informed that MCH will pay compensation to the effected structures as per the Rules and extent all benefits as per the Rules. If landlord desires to avail the benefits to be extended by the MCH on his own volition the landlord may give consent. If the landlord is not willing the letter nowhere compels one to part with the land for widening the road in which event as rightly contended by the learned Standing Counsel the MCH will have to resort to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act.

Learned Standing Counsel for VMC submits that if the land owner is not agreed under private negotiations, land acquisition proposals will be taken up as per the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (LA Act). Therefore, the Writ Petition is misconceived. If the petitioner is not given his consent, it is always open to VMC to initiate action under Section 147 of the Act and acquire the property of the petitioner. In this case, the petitioner has allegedly not given his willingness/consent to cooperate with the VMC for the road widening project. Needless to mention that Corporation has to initiate action under the provisions of LA Act. Till then, the petitioner cannot be deprived of his right to enjoy the property.

The Writ Petition with the above observations is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

27.10.2005

bnr